



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,445	08/09/2001	Mduduzi Keswa	053305-5001	2941

9629 7590 08/19/2005

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,445

Applicant(s)

KESWA, MDUDUZI

Examiner

Joshua D. Campbell

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,5-11,13,15-19,21-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,14,20, and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 06/15/2005.
2. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-29 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 24 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 10, 11, and 18, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) has been withdrawn due to amendments.
4. The rejection of Claims 8, 9, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) has been withdrawn due to amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4, 14, 20, and 26 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5-11, 15-19, 21-24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0165955, filed on May 2, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Silva discloses a method in which a user request is received by a voice server and in response a HTTP request (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). The HTML document is received in response to the request and the document is translated into VoiceXML, at which point a voice server converts it to audible form and presents it to the user (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). Silva does not disclose a method of partitioning the HTML document into a plurality of text sections and link sections. However, Johnson discloses a method in which an HTML document is partitioned into a plurality of text sections and link sections (Page 2, paragraphs 0028-0029 and Page 5, paragraphs 0067-0069). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made and it would have allowed for each section to be analyzed and processed under different standards.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Silva discloses a method in which a plurality of audible cues available for audible selection (earcons) is provided to differentiate between sections of the HTML document (Page 8, paragraphs 0064-Page 9, paragraph 0068 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the

Art Unit: 2178

art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, Silva discloses a method in which a user profile, which includes user default options, is interpreted from a database (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Silva discloses a method in which an HTML parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-formed HTML documents (Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva).

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 15-17, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1 and 5-7. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1 and 5-7.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Silva discloses a method in which a segment of the HTML document is extracted and the tags in the segment are processed (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040). The largest sequence of tags is found and a plurality of segments is formed from the original segment (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 of Silva).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on a plurality of processed text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). Silva also discloses that the HTML document is converted to an object structure (Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva).

Regarding dependent claims 21 and 22, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 8 and 9. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 8 and 9.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Silva discloses a method of making an HTTP connection and accessing a URL, then parsing the document including the header (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva). Silva also discloses a method in which an HTML parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-formed HTML documents (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva). Silva also discloses that the HTML document is converted to an object structure (Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Silva discloses a method in which a user request is received by a voice server and in response a HTTP request (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). The HTML document is received in response to the request and the document is translated into VoiceXML, at which point a voice server converts it to audible form and presents it to the user (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text

sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). Silva discloses a method in which a user profile, which includes user default options, is interpreted from a database (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva).

Silva does not disclose a method of partitioning the HTML document into a plurality of text sections and link sections. However, Johnson discloses a method in which an HTML document is partitioned into a plurality of text sections and link sections (Page 2, paragraphs 0028-0029 and Page 5, paragraphs 0067-0069). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made and it would have allowed for each section to be analyzed and processed under different standards.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Silva discloses a method in which a plurality of audible cues available for audible selection (earcons) is provided to differentiate between sections of the HTML document (Page 8, paragraphs 0064-Page 9, paragraph 0068 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the

method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Silva discloses a method in which an HTML parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-formed HTML documents (Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva).

8. Claims 3, 13, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0165955, filed on May 2, 2001) as

applied to claims 1, 11, and 24 above, and further in view of Mr. Cluey ("How can I find out how many hyperlinks there are on a page?" published on September 10, 2000).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 13, and 25, neither Silva nor Johnson disclose a method in which the link density are used to determine the existence of link sections. However, Mr. Cluey discloses a method in which a document is segmented into components and the amount of links in each component is counted (Page 1-3, "Counting all Links"). Mr. Cluey discloses that the amount of links is obtained (Page 1-3 "Counting all Links"), thus determining if it is a link section. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Silva and Johnson with the method of Mr. Cluey because it would have allowed the user to know exactly how many hyperlinks existed in each section of the page.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the arguments on page 10, in reference to "...partitioning the HTML document into a plurality of text sections and a plurality of link sections..." the examiner believes that Johnson reference teaches this limitation and the 103 combination is proper. Each web page in Johnson consists of one HTML file with one web address (page 2, paragraph 0027 of Johnson). In order to analyze sections the system of Johnson must partition the page based on the sections to be logged into the tracking

system (Page 2, paragraph 0006 of Johnson), these sections do exist among a web page but they are not viewed separately by a normal browser, the tracking system of Johnson partitions them for processing. The motivation for the combination of Johnson and Silva is based on Johnson, which analyzes different sections of web pages to determine click-through traffic, thus it teaches a need for analyzing separate sections of one HTML page for processing.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
August 10, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/17/2005